

My Thoughts on Generative Artificial Intelligence

I dislike AI generated content. A few years ago, I went to an art exhibition for a school trip. Unbeknownst to me, we would spend the first thirty minutes of that exhibition in a gallery of ghastly, soulless AI imagery. I personally felt betrayed – I had wanted to marvel at human creativity, not the result of prompts typed into a computer. Since then, my opposition to AI generated content has only grown, and I have come to have several reasons to justify my dislike of generative AI, with its corporate nature dismissing human creativity.

It seems impossible to browse the internet in 2026 without seeing AI content. It's everywhere, and that's not great. According to a study done by Graphite.io, around 50% of all articles on the internet are AI generated, though it is worth noting that the study may have produced false positives. Anyone who has experimented with AI will know that it is able to generate text and images quite fast. That's partially why there's so much AI content. The speed at which the content is produced allows people to mass produce AI content with little to no quality control. One of the most infamous instances of "AI slop" is a TikTok account named *Fruit Love Island*. It was a quite low quality, zero effort parody of the reality television show *Love Island*, using anthropomorphic fruit instead of people. Somehow, this bizarre content managed to amass 300 million views. The Dead Internet Theory is a concept that states that the Internet is comprised of no more human content, instead being all automated or AI generated content pushed by algorithms, and that nobody you meet on the internet is human. Of course, this is not the case, but with the rise of "AI slop" and AI content now taking up a noticeable fraction of the internet, the theory doesn't seem as far-fetched as it was a decade ago. AI content feels so mind numbing that it gives me the impression those who create it want us to stop thinking for ourselves by spreading fabricated messages.

A topic of concern with AI content is how it hallucinates and spreads misinformation. One must admit that in 2026, AI has developed to the point where it can create coherent news articles and somewhat convincing imagery. This gives propagandists, bad actors and false news outlets the ability to spread misinformation and lies, and tell fabricated stories. Sometimes these stories are alterations of the truth, sometimes they are conjured with no basis in reality. For example, in an earlier draft of this essay, when trying to research how much of the internet was AI generated, Google's AI gave me a statistic that was seemingly hallucinated. This use of AI has been around since AI's infancy around 2023, with misleading imagery being posted on social media sites such as Facebook to mislead the less attentive, and often to gain donations for fake charitable causes. But now in 2026, AI has become so convincing that even I've been tricked by fake videos. This is particularly frightening, because when disinformation is potent, who can you really trust?

This may be a subjective take, but I believe AI content creators disregard human creativity. Mike Shulman, the CEO of Suno, an AI "music" company, once said: "It's not

really enjoyable to make music anymore. You've got to be really good at an instrument... and I think the majority of people don't enjoy the time they spend making music." As a musician myself, I *heavily* disagree with Mike Shulman. I absolutely *love* the time I spend making music. Why else would I undertake the discipline it took to learn a Bach fugue if I didn't enjoy the end result? This train of thought expands, of course, to the wider art world, whether it be visual arts, prose, poetry, film, or any form of self-expression. These are all amazing showcases of perseverance, the human mind and spirit, and to see so much cheap AI content dismiss it completely is saddening, particularly in the art world, where I've seen people devote years of their lives to a single piece. Try as it might, artificial intelligence may attempt to imitate human authenticity, but a prompt typed into a computer shall never capture emotion and spontaneous determination in the same way humans can, and thus, in my opinion, AI content shall always be of lesser quality.

With all this stated, why is there so much AI content at all? Sam Altman, CEO of OpenAI, once said: "I think AI will most likely lead to the end of the world, but in the meantime there'll be some great companies created [with AI]". A large reason so much AI content actually exists is for one reason, and it is rarely to showcase technological advancement. It's money. AI content is generally mass produced, because the more content one has on the internet, the more ad revenue one will receive. This expands far beyond simple videos on social media sites. AI has been embraced by the corporate world, particularly in places like Wall Street, because they see AI content as highly profitable. It's why AI has been promoted to us endlessly by all major companies you can think of – Microsoft, Google, Nvidia, Apple, you truly cannot escape AI's grasp in 2026. Mike Shulman, I believe, cares not for music, but rather sees music as a highly profitable commodity.

For clarification, I don't think *all* uses of AI is bad. A chess computer such as Stockfish poses no harm to human intelligence and is not an existential threat, nor are AI image restoration tools, for example. I specifically dislike content made with generative AI – low effort, mass produced content made with the sole intention of making money, dismissing human creativity and riddled with misinformation and propaganda. But that's simply my opinion, and everyone is entitled to their own opinion. But sometimes it helps to pause and think – will this technology truly help us?